

the heroism of nine children and other members of the Little Rock African-American community when they braved the threat of mob violence to integrate Central High School. Those ordinary people inspired President Eisenhower to send troops in to enforce a Supreme Court decision.

Etheline Dubin lived in this tradition of unusing heroes doing what had to be done. Now she has departed leaving behind her husband, Marshall and two sons: Jonathan and Jason Dubin. Today we do not have the resources and the power to erect a statue for Etheline. But the memorial service was more than just a moment of reflection, meditation and grieving. She is one of our last heroines. We must celebrate our heroines and heroes. We must erect monuments in our minds that will never crumble. We must let Points-of-Light shine that will never go out. We must rededicate our lives to the spirit of unselfish activism in memory of Etheline Dubin.

PREVENTING DEADLY CONFLICT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from August 1997 entitled "Preventing Deadly Conflict."

I ask that this newsletter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

PREVENTING DEADLY CONFLICT

Many thought the end of the Cold War would mean a more peaceful international order. But conflict has not lessened. Today, there are more than 27 conflicts underway around the world.

Conflict prevention is a matter of acute importance for U.S. foreign policy. Whenever or wherever a crisis erupts, the world looks for a U.S. leadership role in resolving it. Public opinion strongly resists a U.S. role as the world's policeman, and policy-makers always ask: What are the alternatives to sending in the Marines? The use of force should be the option of not only last but least resort. Unless a better system of conflict prevention is developed, the burden on the U.S. will be much greater, financially and militarily, to respond to instability and conflict.

Sources of conflict are diverse. Most conflicts today are not between states but within states. Political repression of racial, ethnic or religious groups creates the conditions for conflict. Violence born of desperation becomes the alternative to continued repression.

There are also economic causes. Gross imbalances in living standards can breed conflict. Even economic reform and growth, building blocks of stability, can contribute to conflict. For example, growth has bypassed indigenous populations in many parts of Latin America, and inequality has contributed to armed revolt in Mexico and Peru.

Nations still compete violently for the control of resources. Control of oil and water continue to be a source of contention—and war—in the Middle East. Population pressures can create a serious strain on limited resources, and so can refugees. Most of the world's 15 million refugees today are the result of conflict, but massive refugee movements can also spread conflict and instability.

Much conflict is rooted in deep-seated historical animosities. U.S. diplomacy has helped to stop wars, for example, in the Balkans and Middle East, but long-term resolution of these and other conflicts has been elusive.

What should be done? Because conflict resolution is so complex, we need a comprehensive approach. The challenge is to develop the available arsenal of tools and to use them skillfully. Among these tools are dialogue, mediation, political and economic sticks and carrots, diplomatic pressure from the regional and international communities, sanctions, and—if necessary—international military intervention, either by consent or by force.

At the local level, the primary responsibility for conflict prevention rests with a country itself. Any country will be susceptible to internal violence if there is not economic growth and good governance. If a country has good political, economic and legal mechanisms, tensions can be addressed before violence erupts. Democratic countries with market-based economies have the best record of achieving lasting peace and prosperity.

At the regional level, we should work to increase the effectiveness of security institutions—the Organization of American States, the Organization of African Unity, the ASEAN Regional Forum, and others—to prevent conflict. They should take more responsibility for economic development and integration, the promotion of good governance, and conflict prevention. It is better, for example, if Africans deal with African problems. Regional organizations should support confidence-building measures to increase military transparency, communication, and cooperation. They should develop the capability to apply pressure, offer assistance, or deploy regional forces to prevent conflict.

At the international level, there is much to be done. First, the international community needs a capability for preventive action. This means the ability to deploy civilian personnel—to mediate problems, to provide immediate economic relief, and to address the long-term problems that give rise to conflict. The UN should give higher priority to conflict prevention. Among other things, the international community needs a better system of early warning and response. Conflict seldom arises without warning. Persons knowledgeable about countries are rarely surprised when long-simmering problems escalate into full-scale conflict. The problem is getting timely attention by policy-makers.

Second, the international community needs to address the underlying economic causes of conflict. The U.S. should work with the international community, especially international financial institutions, to support long-term development assistance to achieve economic growth and promote economic opportunity and equality. Working through institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization, the U.S. should support market reform and regional economic integration to bolster growth. The international community must be prepared to apply pressure, even sanctions, to states that do not work to prevent violence or promote conflict resolution.

Third, the international community needs to support political reform and the development of responsive and accountable government. Helping to establish and promote institutions of civil society such as political parties, trade unions, independent media, and the rule of law are important safeguards for protecting human rights, fighting corruption, and fending off political demagoguery. Democratic societies and governments handle political disputes with far less violence.

Finally, the international community must improve its military response to conflicts once they reach the crisis stage. There are many problems in developing the appropriate mechanism for an international military capability to intervene in areas of potential or actual conflict, but it is urgent that these problems be addressed and solutions found. The UN continues to coordinate efforts by governments to train forces and set aside necessary resources for future missions. The U.S. should support these efforts, so that the international community can respond rapidly and effectively if a military response is required.

Conclusion. There is no cure for war and human folly. We will always have both, and the U.S. cannot and should not be responsible for addressing all the world's ills. Yet the U.S., the international community, and individual states can do more to prevent or reduce conflict. Early attention to disputes can save lives as well as the financial and human costs of military intervention. It may not be a message that is popular in the current political climate, but devoting more resources and efforts to conflict prevention is a long-term investment that serves the U.S. national interest.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 1997

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Thursday, September 25, for rollcall votes 453 and 454. Had I been present, I would have voted "no." In addition, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall vote 455 on this same day.

IN RECOGNITION OF COL. TERRY L. RICE

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 1997

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Col. Terry L. Rice, upon his departure from his post as Commander and District Engineer of the Jacksonville District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Among his many duties in the region, Colonel Rice is best remembered for his commitment to the Florida Everglades and the partnerships he developed toward restoration of this priceless national treasure.

Throughout his command at the Jacksonville District, Colonel Rice committed the corps to a balanced approach toward environmental management. He has incorporated creative planning, engineering, construction, and management of projects that encompass the third largest civil works district in the Nation. Historically, the Jacksonville District is known as an innovative global leader in environmental restoration. Colonel Rice has built on this legacy by giving the Army Corps of Engineers a new look in south Florida through his commitment to the people of Florida and his vision for ecosystem restoration.

For those of us in south Florida and all who value the Florida Everglades, I wish Colonel Rice great success in his future endeavors.